

		Are the ordinances fulfilling their intent (supporting the city's traditional center, allowing for a mixture of land uses, dense urban development, pedestrian orientation, unique residential opportunities, and mix of historic and contemporary building des
Yes/No	Subject	
No	Vision	No, A2D2 is changing downtown into a different place losing the character and uses traditional to Ann Arbor - attractive, comfortable, useful, unfriendly to residents, unrecognizable,
No	Design	Ordinances , by observation, do not have effective standards for new building design long term quality or compatibility with historic buildings.
No	Design/Housing Diversity	No. Pedestrian orientation, unique residential opportunities - both important, and both failing.
No	Height	I don't think so. New buildings are too high; sidewalks and streets are narrow relative to the height of the new buildings. Downtown residents seem privileged over people who live in the neighborhoods, and it is hard to bike through the downtown.
No	Height	No, something is wrong with tall buildings overwhelming trees and homes.
No	Height/Bulk	no, the current ordinances are allowing to much building, and too big envelopes. The expensive high-rise is the predominant beneficiary of the current zoning
No	Historic Neighborhoods	The downtown zoning ordinance for D1 does not provide enough protection for near downtown historical and residential neighborhoods/ storical and resident ion neighbors
No	Historic Neighborhoods	NO - too much emphasis on density, not enough on transitional relationships between zoning districts, affordable housing, open space, and bike/ pedestrian safety
No	Historic Neighborhoods	The ordinances are not fulfilling their intent. D1 is too close to historic districts, without enforceable buffers.
No	Historic Neighborhoods	No. The only serious effort to have a buffer between intense development and neighborhoods is on the west side of downtown
No	Housing Diversity	No. They are encouraging ugly student high-rises and nothing more. Make the University build housing themselves“why are we destroying our historic neighborhoods so the University can have cheap housing off-campus? They have plenty of room to build on North Campus.
No	Housing diversity	Not much for neighborhood residents to move downtown. Extend investment to rest of city. How about some neat Welcome ann Arbor signs along the main gateways to the city?
No	Process	A2D2 zoning is not fulfilling any community-based intent, but partially fulfilling intent derived from positions of influence. As a participant on one appointed A2D2 committee, I also observed other A2D2 committees. Community participation was strictly limited. Comments were not recorded at public presentations. The very ordinance flaws which require our attention now, were ignored and even exacerbated with official willfulness that defied repeated alerts from the community. This began with an early internal (budget-driven?) decision to “revise” the zoning ordinances rather than to re-write them. Existing flaws were replaced with the current problematic ones in order to avoid a new form- or performance-based [or hybrid] ordinance. New problems were created. Old ones were not solved.
No	Process/Design	No. The Planning Commission and City Council do not have enough power to assert design changes or outrightly to refuse plans which meet present zoning ordinance.
No	Process/Vision	No, zoning does not match the adopted city planning documents, downtown design guidelines, or the intent statements for actual zoning categories.
No	Process/vision	No. The D1 zoning ordinance does not reflect the intent of the Downtown Plan, the character district overlays, or the design guidelines. It is providing numerical guidelines, but not the guidelines that encourage new development that is sensitive to context. The zoning has not encouraged diverse (or unique) residential opportunities, or required good building design. The scale of new development has ignored the scale of existing structures in terms of creating stepdowns or varied heights. Either the other planning documents (character overlay, etc.) need to be part of site plan evaluation or the ordinance needs to be rewritten to reflect the values that are described in the other planning documents.
No	Vision	No. Rather than create a workable balance, zoning has allowed for terrible developments that threaten the visual and social character of downtown.
No		No--all the citizens I know are very unhappy about the results on E. Huron.
No	Housing diversity	Not satisfactory due to the lack of market-rate apartments, large-plate office space, and a true downtown grocery store.

		Are the ordinances fulfilling their intent (supporting the city's traditional center, allowing for a mixture of land uses, dense urban development, pedestrian orientation, unique residential opportunities, and mix of historic and contemporary building des
Yes/No	Subject	
		The issue, in my view, isn't whether highrise buildings should be occupied by students or young professionals, but whether the assumption that the population density created by such buildings is good for the city. The earlier consultant said it was so, and since then it's been taken as a given. Let's question that.
Not Sure	Density	
Not Sure		I'm not sure about the ordinances themselves.
		We need more density, but we need higher standards for building design (quality materials, sustainability, and character).
Somewhat	Density/Design	
Somewhat	Height	ordinances allow too much height, shortage of parking, create wind tunnels. They do increase pedestrians.
		Somewhat, but not enough. Need to have stronger standards (requirements) for pedestrian orientation, true mixed uses or mixed residential types, enduring building design, and respect for adjacent properties -- especially those of lower density/intensity.
Somewhat	Historic Neighborhoods	
Somewhat	Housing Diversity	somewhat but would be better not to have more high-rise student housing
		Yes. A more densely populated down town will help to slow sprawl outward. Also, the more opportunity to live and work down town, the more diverse retail, etc, will move into downtown. We are currently restaurant, boutique, gift shopping rich, but practical shopping poor down town.
Yes	Density	
Yes	Density	I believe they are. They are creating more residential density in proximity to most of the jobs in our region.
		Judging by the additional high density housing going up, if that was the goal, it is working. I wonder about why grocery stores are missing.
Yes	Density	
Yes	Design	Mostly they are, although a bit more freedom in design and building type might create more varied buildings (a good thing).
		I think the A2D2 ordinances are adequate and suit the vision established. I believe the zoning commission has failed to lead the discussion back to the vision, and to stand by it. There does seem that there could be some tweaking to allow greater variety and incentivize better buildings-- greener, denser, more affordable and more interesting-looking buildings. Grand Rapids seems to have great leadership re development AND community buy in. Have we looked at their model?
Yes	Vision	
		Yes. If you zone it they will come. We zoned it. They came. A large building looming over a historic property is not the end of the world. What we're hearing now is some minor bellyaching about the fact that much of the housing being built will be occupied by students.
Yes	Vision	
Yes		So what? Are students not human beings who are also a part of our community?
		Yes, despite all the ravenous NIMBYism around all this, it is working.
		Generally yes. There are some lots between the core and the lower scale surrounding neighborhoods that could be changed to reflect a transition in scale.
Yes	Scale	
No comment.		

**TOTALS:**

Yes	8
No	18

**Subjects**

Historic Neighborhoods	5
Density	4
Housing Diversity	4
Vision	4
Height	3
Design	2
Process	1
Scale	1

**Thinking about your specific observation: what are the positive aspects that came of this project that you have observed? Think about examples, such as allowable uses, height and massing, floor area limits/premiums and design.**

Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3
		I believe that density downtown is necessary and very appropriate along the large thoroughfares. Large developments are placed next to historic districts in larger cities all the time. I believe the historic districts benefit aesthetically by the contrast afforded. I think the citizenry are not imagining a positive future that includes downtown development. I believe they are caught in a trap of reactive nostalgia and nimbyism. This is normal actually. It is the job of the city council and zoning to lead them to a full understanding of the tradeoffs if we don't grow as planned. I do not think we have asked the citizenry the hard questions-- are you willing to trade diversity, local businesses, more green public spaces and a sustainable city tax base to keep this town as it is -- stuck in time-- forever--- or better yet, what do you want the town to be--- not just building aesthetics, but who should live here, what stores should be open here--- And then design the buildings in response to what people want instead of designing them in avoidance of what they don't want.
Density	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts	Vision
Density		certainly got the density
Density		I regard any increase in downtown density as a positive, especially when TIF supports streetscaping and structured parking in new buildings.
		None, so far, as all of the projects that have been approved in the D1 zoning areas exceed all recommendations for height and interface with the public right of way, e.g. inadequate setbacks, insensitive relationship to adjacent historic properties, lack of transition to adjacent residential zoning, lack of context with adjacent, pre-existing buildings.
Design	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts	
Design	Premiums	Premiums should not be given to projects that do not follow the recommendations of the Design Review Board.
		I can't think of any tangible positive aspects. However, the general public has been more than disappointed with A2D2. Participation was high until evidence of response to public opinion went from scarce to none. A set of design guidelines was approved for the first time. However, compliance is voluntary. There is not much to show in terms of intent to have positive impact on building design.
Design	Process	
Design		The new buildings look, architecturally, pretty good. It's too soon to tell, by observation, what the practical impacts on the city are or will be.
		We were able to build up, which is much better and cheaper (for taxpayers) than building "out." The main issue is sub-par building design. Size and massing were fine. Some sites do well with tall buildings and allowing them is fine. The buildings at South University and Forest is appropriate. It's just very ugly.
Design	Height	
Design	Height	
	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts	
Height		Generally, allowing more height in downtown while protecting the lower historic areas.
LEED		The only benefit I see consistently is that there are more buildings built with LEED requirements.
		I am presuming that the renovated warehouse on Liberty is part of this plan. I like this area of downtown the best - the condos, the area for the art displays in the warehouse, walk to restaurants, surrounded by other older houses. This looks very liveable, if I could afford it.
Mixed Use	Design	
Mixed Use		Mixed use developments are quite common now in Ann Arbor. They create a nice vibrant feeling in the downtown, due to less down time at the building (they're used longer than 9 to 5).
Mixed Use		Perhaps we have added more allowable uses, but that is still not obvious.
Mixed Use		411 Lofts with Babos is a perfect example. That corner has truly come alive and it's not just students using it.
		Positive aspect is the mix of uses being introduced within buildings. Particularly the way parking and retail has been integrated into the architecture
Mixed Use		
Mixed Use		Nobody knows what those terms mean for crying out loud. The use mixtures are OK.

Thinking about your specific observation: what are the positive aspects that came of this project that you have observed? Think about examples, such as allowable uses, height and massing, floor area limits/premiums and design.

Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3
None		No positives thus far. Why did the City create a plan/vision for downtown without any way to make developers comply?
None		Sorry--nothing positive emerges.
None		None of the above. The negative change is caused by the new versions of these standards.
None		Not much
None		There are no positive aspects.
Premiums		we should abolish premiums that allow for larger building envelopes. The emphasis should be on smaller, more to-scale development
Process		discussion of issues
Process		It is positive that the process is being reviewed for improvements. [Survey unclear terms such as 'massing' should be defined]
Process		It's positive that folks are beginning to question the assumptions behind the project.
Process		I think it's great that there's been relatively little controversy about most of the projects. But when there's one building that people don't like, A2D2 is declared a failure in need of review. Bah.
Process		I am amazed that there finally was some degree of consensus on passing anything, after working on this for literally years. I think it's good to have design review as an element. Floor area limits/premiums are reasonable.
Vision		I have been out of town and have not seen the details, but the bottom line is that the city should have the right to protect itself. This is not imply a playground for developers and bad architects.
Walkability		The walkable, interesting corridors are expanding down town from the traditional, narrow, limited ones.

No comment.

Until new zoning changes are determined I find no benefits from having focus groups.

#### TOTALS

Design	7
Process	6
Mixed Use	6
None	5
Density	3
Height	3

#### Historic Neighborhoods/

Districts	3
Premiums	2
Vision	2
LEED	1
Walkability	1

			What are negative aspects you have observed? And what do you think needs to change about the ordinance to address these issues, such as as it pertains to allowable uses, height and massing, floor area limits/premiums and design?
Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	
Bulk	Design		The massing is an issue - and the premiums used to get that massing. I don't mind residential, but do find the benefits of good design consistently unrealized.
Bulk	Height	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts	The buildings are too big, and too out of place. there is supposed to be a buffer between the neighborhoods and the large buildings, and this simply does not exist. The assignment of D! permissible heights on the edges of downtown is a mistake that needs immediate remedy
Bulk	Height	Premiums	Reduce these new extremes of height, mass, premiums
Bulk	Height	Setbacks	Buildings piggishly large, aesthetically awful, little thought given to placement, setbacks, spacing.
Bulk	Height		Height and massing limitations should be mandatory if a development has negative impact upon its neighbors.
Bulk	Height		Developers have generally built to maximum height and area restrictions in order to maximize financing and their associated fees.
Bulk	Housing Diversity		I think the diversity of buildings in view from the street is seriously lacking in newer developments. Developers will build out to the allowable limits because building here is so expensive. We could make their projects workable by giving them some square footage on top in exchange for things like green/public space (like plazas) and green or diverse buildings. I like the idea of the diagonals approach as opposed to height restrictions. I also heartily support smaller floor area limits. I'd like to see more 1 and 2 bedroom apartments available. Many young people will trade space for location. Not just students. I'd like to see workforce housing downtown.
Bulk			There are areas where the scale changes too abruptly, allowing no transition in scale.
Context	Height	Premiums	Height and massing has to be sensitive to context, premiums should only be used in very special instances, or abolished altogether, the design guidelines should carry more weight, at least scale and massing should be incorporated into the zoning so that new development fits the site and the surroundings.
Context	Housing Diversity	Solar Access	In my estimation, the greatest negative aspect of the A2D2 ordinance revisions is the failure to address context: social, environmental and economic. This means that there has been intense resistance to several new mid/high-rise D1 projects. It also means that the roles of beneficial green space and orientation to the sun have been diminished or ignored. Further, the mono-cultural character of new projects has diminished economic diversity. There are many housing units which are leased by the bed, and clustered around common living areas with a kitchen a use which is still not explicitly permitted in the ordinance. Specifically, existing highly-valued building patterns such as historic districts and attractive pedestrian corridors have suffered.
Context	Housing Diversity		The negative aspect is that it created a "free fire zone" for student high rises and other bad projects because of insufficient buffers and (supposedly) unenforceable character districts.
Design	Height		Incentive for Ann Arbor families and residents to come downtown. No class in the architecture. Ugly tall cheap buildings. Nothing special that differentiates Ann Arbor from other cities.
Design	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts		The "ordinance" really needs to beef up the transitional schema--perhaps adding a D3? It's clear that the D1 zoning abutting historic districts is extremely inappropriate. The Varsity (the building on Washington that goes all the way to Huron) juts out between historic houses and makes them ridiculous. The problem seems to be that rigid zoning cannot handle many situations that involve neighborhoods and thus need to be done on a case by case basis. The fact that the Design Guidelines are voluntary is another problem.
Design	Historic Neighborhoods/ Districts		There is no required respect for adjacent properties, particularly those in a different zoning district. This undermines historic districts and property owners of less dense properties. I'm not a fan of height limits, but I do like FAR. Some kind of requirement is needed to avoid monolithic single use buildings (like residential projects that only cater to students or senior citizens). Some design standards should be requirements.

			What are negative aspects you have observed? And what do you think needs to change about the ordinance to address these issues, such as as it pertains to allowable uses, height and massing, floor area limits/premiums and design?
Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	
Design	Pedestrian Amenities	Setbacks	I would love to see more unique design and slightly larger setbacks. I would also like more pedestrian details like the new connection at the Varsity.
Design	Use		A bit nicer design at the pedestrian level would be nice, instead of flat and boring walls abutting the sidewalk. The amount of allowable uses is small, hurting creative building use/creation in the downtown area. Finally, more uses and types of buildings should be allowed by right in order to improve the process for developers.
Design	Use		The ordinance should include stricter language about building materials and design but allow for mixed use and high density.
Design			I am fine with the increase in private student housing, but I would prefer to see stronger aesthetic design standards (form-based code) or a review process with teeth.
District Location	Vision		D2 Zoning needs to be EVERYWHERE along the edge of D1 to provide a buffer zone into residential areas. The recent Huron Street project is poster child on what the "vision" was supposed to prevent.
Height	Historic Neighborhoods/Districts		too tall buildings and not enough emphasis on preservation of historic buildings
Height	Historic Neighborhoods/Districts		Height should be limited to 6 stories with design standards that better mesh with historic buildings
Height	Premiums	Solar Access	Reduce maximum heights to the original 10 stories recommended in the Calthorpe Study; eliminate premiums that encourage additional height, required setbacks and stepbacks that protect adjacent historic and residential properties; protect natural features and solar access.
Height	Premiums		get rid of premiums use some other criteria than floor area, keep heights to 4 stories west of Huron and south of Main
Height			Heights of new/planned buildings, please consider existing neighborhoods.
Historic Neighborhoods/Districts	Housing Diversity		The "premium" student housing is being overbuilt. The high-rise buildings being built and as proposed do not respect adjacent historic properties and are totally out of character.
Housing diversity	Density	Use	I like the mixed-use buildings with residential and shops/businesses. More urban density that caters to families. I don't want to see a bunch of "student" highrises - rather, if we are going to have high-rises, let's include families/couples rather than just student housing. If the majority of high-rises only cater to young adults or students, that will be more negative for the community than if those are actually ownership-based "homes" for families or empty-nesters. I think the difference in community perception will depend on long-term residents.
Housing diversity			The negative aspect is that the larger buildings are being built and marketed as student housing. So instead of 2-3 people in a two bedroom flat, there are now 4-6 people in that same flat. And because it is off campus, most of these tenants also have cars. I think the best solution is to better limit occupancy within apartment units.
Lot combinations	Process		The proposed ordinance was hijacked by special interests. Most important is the issue of combining lots
None			I haven't observed negatives yet.
Parking			Folks living downtown are never going to forgo owning cars (another assumption I've heard from advocates.) Traffic and parking are going to be horrendous, as it is now in Berkeley, California. Clusters of highrise buildings create a sterile concrete environment that's barely tolerable in a big city, but, in my view, totally wrong for TreeTown.

			What are negative aspects you have observed? And what do you think needs to change about the ordinance to address these issues, such as as it pertains to allowable uses, height and massing, floor area limits/premiums and design?
Subject 1	Subject 2	Subject 3	
Process			I feel the primary negative has been the derisive nature of a handful of individuals who are whipping people into a lather because they do not want anything to change, ever. This is unfortunante because it means reasonable discussion does not occur. On more than one occasion it appears that projects have defaulted to the least desirable common denominator because of delay tactics and unfortunate behavior. If I was running a project and was met with some of the shenanigans that have gone on, I would be less inclined to offer anything other than the letter of the ordinance. Sad but true.
Process			The negative aspect of the citizens participation ordinance and the design review board is that these mechanisms are seized upon by the "freeze it in amber" crowd as ways they are supposed to be able to assert their aesthetic preferences, and when they don't get their way one time, they say we need to rethink the whole zoning scheme. Bah.
			4RC and perhaps other designations' back-of-lot size restrictions should be revisited. Specifically, 30% of the rear 20 ft. of one's lot is not enough. One should be able to construct garages and outbuildings that span their lot, more or less, as is done in many, many other urban areas.
Setbacks			

Total mentions:

Height	12
Bulk	7
Design	8
Historic	
Neighborhoods/ Districts	6
Housing Diversity	6
Premiums	4
Context	3
Process	2
Setbacks	2
Use	3
Solar Access	2
Lot Combinations	1
Parking	1

What are the top three priorities you would like the Planning Commission to consider as it relates to downtown development?			
Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	
Vision	Green Building	Housing Diversity	Clear and shared vision-- revisit, rewrite, make the choices clear to people. Green building incentives. Affordable housing-- smaller spaces= more density and affordable rents in a viable development.
Context	Design	Housing Diversity	how the development fits the neighborhood, interesting architecture, affordable housing
Efficiency	Pedestrian	Housing Diversity	1) Increase the efficiency of the free market 2) Pedestrian oriented design 3) Allow more housing. A lot more.
Process	Design		The Planning Commission must be involved in the public discussion of all the recommendations of the Design Guidelines Review Board.
Housing Diversity	Mixed Use	Business Diversity	No more student ghettos/high-rises. Promote new small/local businesses. Ban fast food/franchises. Promote affordable housing for residents from all walks of life, not just students.
Height	Setbacks	Parking	Height limits and sidewalk setbacks. Also, parking has become a serious disincentive for me to come downtown.
Height	Design	Pedestrian	Provide enforceable protective D2 buffers between D1 heights and other lower height limitations. Require some degree of compliance with design guidelines, especially where the character of adjacent districts may differ. Ensure the dominance of the pedestrian experience in planning objectives. (Or, write a new code that addresses form and performance!)
Pedestrian	Housing Diversity	Green Space	Pedestrian scale and safety; housing for non-students as a priority; public park linkages, e.g. Allen Creek and Huron River access.
Lot combination	Setbacks	Design	1. Lot combination, 2. Street offsets, 3. Aesthetic guidelines
Vision	Density	Activity	Recognize the value and uniqueness of each existing streetscape, require the zoning to reflect the values in ALL the planning documents, have an active downtown as the goal, not simply a "dense" downtown.
Process	Density	Activity	Don't be swayed by angry, older residents that have forgotten that, for better or worse, students are the heart and soul of Ann Arbor. People may not be used to high rises, but they are not harming our community and will only bring positive density and activity downtown.
Infrastructure			All new development should stop until the city resolves the storm and sanitary sewer problems.
Green Space	Density/Height	Mixed Use	green space in downtown, building height and density of housing, services like grocery stores for those living downtown
Density	Outbuildings		Outbuilding regulations. Should also allow rental of residential outbuildings, as is done in many other urban areas. If the city is serious about pursuing density, this only makes sense.
Height	Design	Infrastructure	(1) limit height restriction to 30 feet and require application for variance to build higher; (2) allow City Council to pass judgement on appearance and design characteristics; (3) require developers to pay for site development and needed utilities.
Green Space	Design	Infrastructure	1] Maintain downtown individual family homes, trees and parks in mix use 2] new building design supports long term alternative use and 3] A2 infrastructure can handle , e.g. sewers, etc.
Density	Housing Diversity		Stay this course. Down town density of housing will lead to the sale of some of the chopped up homes in the downtown area, back to single family housing. A nicely maintained, single family home is far preferable to a chopped up, poorly maintained rental property.
Walkability	Sustainability	Design	Promote walkability, sustainability, and high-quality building design.
Historic Neighborhoods/Districts	Height	Housing Diversity	Preserving historic Ann Arbor; lower/less looming buildings in downtown; mixture of housing.
Green Space	Height	Design	how to keep open space and park space, how to limit the size of buildings, and giving actual authority to the design review process
Vision	Process	Enforcement	Decide what is good and protect it, write into zoning the protective elements laid out in the adopted Plans, enforce the Codes
Housing Diversity	Buffers	Height	occupancy within apartment units. transition from the downtown district to the residential surrounding downtown. greater stepdown from downtown heights adjacent to residential zoned land



What are the top three priorities you would like the Planning Commission to consider as it relates to downtown development?		
Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3
Premiums		1.Elimate the use of builder premiums
Housing Diversity	Transportation	Parking
		Affordability, adequate access to transportation and parking.
Housing Diversity	Density	Liberty Plaza
Design	Process	More market-rate apartments for the general public, complete overhaul of Liberty Plaza, and very high density for development on city land sold to developers (e.g. library lot).
		Mandatory design guidelines. Early design review.
Height	Green Space	Business Diversity
		We prefer a low-rise city, with tree-lined streets, and locally owned shops and restaurants. Like Fourth Avenue/ Kerrytown has become. Even Seva has had to leave! Will Herb David's old building and the Jerusalem café resist future developers' offers? Not likely.
		We need basic services within walking / biking distance from housing. High density housing without cooresponding services (e.g. grocery stores) just reverse the problems of suburban sprawl.
Mixed Use	Services	
		Incentives for families - more welcoming for local residents that live around downtown but still in the city
Housing Diversity	Mixed Use	
Parking	Premiums	Eliminate parking requirements, even for "premium" FAR.
		1) Appropriate transitions between housing types / architectural styles / density/ site character. 2) Pedestrian and bicycle safety; 3) Street trees / shade / protections from elements 4) electric/solar buses
Buffers	Pedestrian	Solar Access
		Carry out the Downtown Plan, which requires ordinances regulating lot combinations. Set a mandatory height limit of 6 stories for all development in D1 and D2. Establish enforceable character districts.
Vision	Height	Design
Historic Neighborhoods/Districts	Buffers	
		Respect for historic districts, respect for neighborhoods downtown, and no more demolitions of historic buildings.
Design	Buffers	Mixed Use
		Contextual design (including respect for adjacent/nearby properties of lesser intensity), building design, mixed uses and/or mixed intensities/densities.
Bulk	Lot Combination	Buffers
		Impact on adjoining R neighbors; variety in building massing, complex issues about large footprint buildings - how lots are combined.
TOTALS		
Design		11
Housing Diversity		11
Height/Bulk		9
Buffers/Context		6
Mixed Use/Services		6
Green Space		6
Vision		4
Process		4
Historic Neighborhoods/Districts		2
Premiums		2
Lot Combination		2
Business Diversity		2
Solar Access		1
Sustainability		1
Transportation		1
Walkability		1
Enforcement		1
Liberty Plaza		1
Efficiency		1

---

**Have you seen examples of techniques, ordinances or standards in other communities that you think would work well in Ann Arbor?**

I do not know what the zoning is in Grand Rapids but its downtown is becoming beautifully revitalized and in some surprising places. Boulder is building smarter than us as well.

Birmingham MI has standards but may be too uniform. They do create a town atmosphere.

Very few cities are like Ann Arbor

Although the design guidelines can be improved, the process of the Guidelines Review Board must be made more mandatory.

San Francisco and New Orleans (pre-Katrina, at least) both have zoning ordinances that control the nature of new developments in order to preserve character or neighborhoods.

I think we should look to Washington DC, where there are strict height limits and very nice setbacks from the sidewalks. That is what makes it such a pleasant city to walk around.

Stop using building density as a planning objective. Use other techniques to increase beneficial population density. Look at the benefits of population density in terms of the triple [social, environmental, economic] bottom line, rather than relying on building density to increase tax revenues. Enhance service alleys to accommodate "secondary addresses". Establish sun access requirements, including building orientation. Establish tree canopy preservation regulations. Aim for sidewalks that are wide enough to accommodate amenities, approximately 16 feet minimum. Consider requiring a percentage of building frontage be recessed or open to the sky behind the building line to modulate the street wall and increase surfaces available for windows and landscape elements at the walkway.

Mandatory design review works in Birmingham and Kalamazoo, as well as in more distant places like Portland, OR.

Yes, some communities that recognize their assets and then tailor their zoning accordingly - i.e. Charleston SC, church steeples are predominant landmarks, zoning reflects that in height restrictions and viewsapes, Washington, DC has similar restrictions for similar reasons, Greenville SC - zoning considerations incorporate protection of historic district

Copenhagen is always a great place to look for urban design inspiration that is working in harmony with TRULY historic areas.

See above.

Not familiar with zoning ordinances of other municipalities.

Chicago parks and building design that mesh with historic areas and built with quality that will last for eons.

Not that come quickly to mind.

San Diego has SETBACKS for its buildings so that there is sufficient space and pedestrians own the sidewalks! yes, emphasize the historic districts, don't allow for outsized building , insist that all builders comply with the agreements as it relates to size, parking, etc, don't allow them to trade off parking with the DDA, if they say they are going to have x number of spots hold them to it!

Bigger and greater tax base is not always better. As Ann Arbor is being exploited, it is losing its character."

---

**Have you seen examples of techniques, ordinances or standards in other communities that you think would work well in Ann Arbor?**

NYC for height/density bonuses, Chicago for TIF/Tax Capture districts, Birmingham for predictable and productive design standards.

Limit height to four stories throughout downtown.

Yes.....

Houston, we do not have a problem.

Boulder, CO (too late for A2) has a height limit of 4 stories in the downtown. High-rise student apartments are on the periphery and mass transit and bike trails are excellent. Also Portland, and Eugene OR

Columbus Ohio --they have student housing near the campus but they are mostly 3-4 story buildings. I don't know the ordinances governing them but they don't have huge apartment buildings looming over neighborhoods.

Not lately.

I've seen results - but not studied how those results occurred.

---

---

**Is there anything else you would like to share or have the consultant consider?**

---

The language of this survey is beyond the reach of the average citizen. It is filled with unapproachable zoning specific language and does not ask the hard questions.

I would love to live downtown and do not think there are enough options

The power of the Historical Commission over D1 zoned sites near historically designated neighborhoods must be considered as a part of the site plan approval process.

Disallow further [non-complying] private lease-by-the-bed student housing blocks. Require outdoor dining leased in the public right of way frontage to be at the building, so that conflict is reduced between servers and pedestrians. Preserve maximum clear widths for pedestrian access. Encourage intermittent "front yard" areas help to create pedestrian and bicycle routes as robust as vehicle routes. Reduce visual clutter in the public right of way. Change First and Ashley streets to two-way traffic to enhance the increasingly residential character. Make sure that significant changes in planning and zoning elements are community based.

Make zoning accountable to and compatible with the city's planning documents.

There have to be standards - horrible architecture such as City Place and the Varsity should not be allowed-they do not fit into their surroundings and creat a form of blight.

D1 and D2 were an attempt to simplify and make development easier, but placing a blanket zoning ordinance for new development over a varied cityscape creates problems unless those new ordinances require context-oriented development. Our ordinance does not and that needs to be corrected.

I'm sorry you have to take on so much hostility. I wish people saw how AMAZING Ann Arbor truly is. It is such a special place compared to 98% of the rest of our country. These high rises may be new, but before people know it, they'll be old news. This is mostly reactionism and a prejudice against students.

Nope.

Community input should be more broadly sought perhaps by including surveys and invitations for comment with city bills and other communications with Ann Arbor residents and property owners.

no

Higher density can be achieved while still preserving the character of downtown. This would be beneficial to everyone.

Focus group at Kerrytown Concert Hall was well conducted. Glad you are having focus groups. Hope you listen to them.

---

**Is there anything else you would like to share or have the consultant consider?**

---

It is long since time to close the door on outsized development. Developers should have to pay premiums to build here. The city should not be allowed to sell its downtown properties without consent of the people, the usual MO for planning around here is to react, we need instead to reduce the allowable size of buildings to almost nothing, and make developers request zoning exemptions to exceed that size, more weight needs to be given to public hearings on zoning, also, it is wrong that city council members are not allowed to petition the planning commission when one council member is allowed to sit on the planning commission. This will be the second time I filled this out, the first time the count did not go up, how do I know that this is even going to be read?

William Holly Whyte.

I recognize that urban change is inevitable, but I think the assumptions behind the push for downtown density need to be examined and, I hope, discredited. The current zoning regulations should be revised.

Too much focus on downtown - - it is isolating itself from the other parts of the city

The only consideration for new buildings that really warrants scrutiny is this: Will all those toilets flush? Sanitary sewer capacity is THE infrastructure issue this city faces. I don't think we should dump our untreated sewage into the river.

Tall buildings create wind tunnels, cause icing of sidewalks, and are not what this community wants. Heights should be limited to 6 - 8 stories for future buildings and the total mass and SF should not be increased by more than 10% in the CBD.

Not at this time.

Don't be precipitous in throwing out all of D1 zoning - but do consider more than two scales (now it's 180 feet, 60 feet, 30 feet -- too abrupt a change. Should limit height in different ways - keep building massing, but restrict premiums further.)

---